

special historical studies being commissioned, is in fact experiencing an increased momentum with work being done today by numerous scholars. See: Micronesian Area Research Center, University of Guam, *Spanish Documents Translation Projects*, special projects on Japanese administrations, D.A. Ballendorf, *et.al.*, "Oral Historiography of the Japanese Administration in Palau," Kathleen Owings, ed., "Chamorro Recollections of WWII," Scott Russell, "Historical and Archaeological Research in Micronesia," *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 92:1, March 1983, pp.117-121, and *Palau Historic Preservation Office*, Oral Histories of Palau, 1990.

32. Any construct of a philosophical basis to intrinsic Micronesian history will have to await considerable further investigation. It is unknown how native specialists intellectualize their past experience, *i.e.*, linear or cyclical, optimistic or pessimistic, God-directed, or of free will.

33. The work in this area of historiography is still in its beginning stages. Major efforts have been made by the Palau Community Action Agency, the Historic Preservation Office, and the Protestant Lebenszell Mission in recording oral history testimonies and legends of elderly citizens. At Fiji, the Institute of Pacific Studies has made contributions, and at Guam, the Micronesian Area Research Center continues its work in this area.

34. This metaphor is used by Howe in his "Epilogue: The New Historiography," in *Where the Waves Fall*, *Ibid.*

35. The term "west" here is meant to describe metropolitan, highly developed technological societies, inclusive of those in the Orient.

36. An excellent accounting with statistics can be found in: Francis X. Hezel, "The Education Explosion in Truk", *Reflections on Micronesia*, UHawaii, Pacific Islands Studies Working Paper Series, 1982; also, R. L. Workman, *et.al.*, *Island Voyagers in New Quests: A Study of Degree Completion Among Micronesian College Students*, Micronesian Area Research Center, Final Report, 1981, University of Guam.

37. Workman, *et.al.*, *Ibid.*; see also: *Annual Reports*, 1975 to 1983, U.S. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, TTPI.

38. Many current accounts appear today in the periodical literature in the region, which is increasing rapidly in its appearance throughout Micronesia. Some notable examples are: *Pacifica 84*, *The Marshall Islands Journal*,

*The National Union*, *Rengil Belau*, and *The Palau Chronicle*; some books by islanders which have appeared are: Pedro Sanchez, *Uncle Sam Please Come Back to Guam*, Guam, Island Press, 1980; Anthony Palomo, *Island in Agony*, Taiwan Press, 1984; Carl Heine, *Micronesia at the Crossroad*, Honolulu, UHawaii Press, 1975, and Chris Perez Howard, *Maraquta*, Guam Press, 1982. See also: PCAA, *Ibid.*, and PIMS, *Ibid.*

39. *Peace Corps/Micronesia Program Plan, 1984*, Ponape Headquarters, FSM, 1984; Dirk A. Ballendorf and Howard Seay, "Catalysts or Barnacles: The First Five Years of the Peace Corps in Micronesia," *Oceania and Beyond: Essays on the Pacific Since 1945*, F.P. King, ed., Greenwood Press, 1975; "The Peace Corps in Oceania, 1966 to 1980, With Particular Reference to Micronesia," Conference Paper, Dirk A. Ballendorf, *Education in Oceania*, University of Victoria, British Columbia, 1980, copy at the Micronesian Area Research Center.

40. Ballendorf, *Education in Oceania*, *Ibid.*

41. *Ibid.*, see also: "Peace Corps Reunion," *Pacific Daily News*, 20 May 1984.

42. Ballendorf and Seay, *Ibid.*

43. The Trust Territory Office of Historic Preservation was a federally funded program in Micronesia, available throughout the United States, and extended to Micronesia in 1971. It was phased-out when the Trusteeship ended. The office continues in Palau.

44. See: Scott Russell, *Ibid.*

45. See: *The History of Palau*, 3 Volumes, Koror, Palau, Palau Community Action Agency, 1975; also: *Legends of Palau*, PCAA, 1978.

46. See: University of Guam, course syllabii: ED200: History of Education in Micronesia, HI243: History of Micronesia, HI444: Pacific History; AN320: Anthropology of the Pacific Area; AN420: Anthropological Problems of Guam and Micronesia.

47. Department of Education, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan Headquarters; also; Guam Department of Education, Agana, Guam.



the Japanese administration. He learned to read and write his native language at an American mission school.

21. The Institute of Pacific Studies has published, to date, over 100 titles in the categories of (1) Land and Rural Development, (2) Politics and Government, (3) History and Biography, (4) Social and Cultural, (5) Language and Communication, (6) Poetry, (7) Drama, and (8) Dance. A comprehensive listing can be obtained from the Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, box 1168 Suva, Fiji.
22. "Paradigm" is used here to connote a singular and distinguishable historiographical approach with all its elements. The term follows the theoretical description of paradigms as outlined in Thomas H. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press, 1973, second edition.
23. During these various colonial administrations several exhaustive studies were made under official auspices. Two important Spanish sources are: Father Aniceto Ibanez del Carmen and Father Francisco Resano, *et.al.*, *Chronicle of the Mariana Islands*, translated and annotated by Marjorie G. Driver, Micronesian Area Research Center, University of Guam, Publication no. 5, 1976, and "Fray Juan Pobre de Zamora and His Account of the Mariana Islands," *Journal of Pacific History*, Notes and Documents, v.18, July 1983, n.3, pp.198-216. An important German work is: Georg Thilenius, *Ergebnisse der Suedsee Expedition, 1908-1990*, Hamburg, 1914. Following their occupation of the islands in 1914, the Japanese government sent an investigating team of scientists from Tokyo University to report on Micronesia. Their work was subsequently published by the Ministry of Education in 1934; see: *Nihon Gyosei Gakkai*, (Japanese Administration Studies Association), ed., *Bankin Dai Nihon Takushoku shi*, (Recent colonial history of Japan), Tokyo: Nihon Gyosei Gakkai, 1934, section 6 "Nan'yo." There are a number of American studies, but only one formal study which treats the early period of naval administration; see: Dorothy E. Richard, *United States Naval Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands*, 3 volumes, Washington D.C., Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, 1957-1963. These works serve to characterize the various periods, the list is by no means exhaustive.
24. F. W. Christian, *The Caroline Islands*, London, Cass and Company, Ltd., new impression, 1967, (first edition 1899).
25. Christian was a British gentleman-traveler who lived for a time in Samoa where he was a neighbor of Robert Louis Stevenson. His extensive travels in Micronesia and his detailed recording and accounting, made his work one of the most important references prior to the Japanese period in Micronesia. Indications of Christian's views of the islanders are found throughout his work. A typical statement is: "Trouble is always going on between the various tribes, and a firm hand is needed to keep things in order." (p.17) Another observation is: "Captain O'Keefe, of Yap, who knows the Pelews [*sic.*] very well, describes the people as regular pirates." (p.18)
26. Yanaihara Tadao, *Pacific Islands Under Japanese Mandate*, Shanghai, Kelly and Walsh, Ltd., 1939.
27. Yanaihara Tadao was a professor of colonial administration, government and economics at Tokyo Imperial University (University of Tokyo), and one of the most liberal and enlightened of Japan's colonial theorists. He believed in the "complete and systematic assimilation of the Micronesians into modernity, which meant . . . Japanese modernity." See: Mark R. Peattie, *Ibid.*, Professor Yanaihara discusses his own points of view in his *Pacific Islands Under Japanese Mandate*, pp.292-198.
28. Davidson, *Ibid.*, p.7.
29. The critics are numerous and articulate. Some of the main ones are: David Nevin, *The American Touch in Micronesia*, New York, W.W. Norton, 1975; Frank P. King, ed., *Oceania and Beyond: Essays on the Pacific Since 1945*, Westport, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 1976; Donald F. McHenry, *Micronesia: Trust Betrayed*, New York, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1975; Roger W. Gale, *The Americanization of Micronesia*, Washington, D.C., University Press of America, 1979; Nat J. Colletta, *American Schools for the Natives of Ponape*, UHawaii Press, 1980; Robert C. Kiste, *The Bikinians: A Study in Forced Migration*, Menlo Park, California, Cummings Publishing Company, 1974; and, Harold Nufer, *Micronesia Under American Rule: An Evaluation of the Strategic Trusteeship, 1947-1977*, New York, Exposition Press, 1978.
30. None of the American critics question the benevolent motivations or rights of the American presence in the islands; rather, they point up the hypocritical aspects of the administration, its poor performance over the years, inconsistencies, and benign neglect.
31. This process of interpretation from various colonial archives, current oral histories being undertaken, and

Samoa, and other smaller reefs and islands, some of which are uninhabited. See: *Pacific Islands Yearbook*.

2. See: Paul Carano and Pedro C. Sanchez, *A Complete History of Guam*, Rutland, Vermont, Tuttle and Company, 1964, for a good general consideration of the extension of Spanish control after 1885; also see: Francis X. Hezel, "Spanish Capuchins in the Western Carolines," *Journal of Pacific History*, v.4, 1970, p.234ff.

3. The literature on the Japanese period is becoming increasingly and widely available. The most recent and comprehensive work in English is Mark R. Peattie, *Nan'yo: The Rise and Fall of the Japanese in Micronesia, 1895 to 1945*, University of Hawaii Press, 1988. Some other good references are: Ramon H. Myers and Mark R. Peattie, eds., *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1984; Paul Clyde, *Japan's Pacific Mandate*, New York, MacMillan, 1935; Yanaihara Tadao, *Pacific Islands Under Japanese Mandate*, Kelly and Walsh, Shanghai, 1939; Hatanaka Sachiko, "Micronesia Under the Japanese Mandate," *A Bibliography of Micronesia*, Tokyo, Research Institute for Oriental Studies, Gakushuin University, 1977; and, Nan'yo Gunto Kyokai (South Seas Association) eds., *Omoide no Nan'yo gunto* (Recollections of the South Sea Islands), Tokyo, 1965.

4. Antonio Pigafetta, *First Voyage Around the World*, Manila, Filipiniana Book Guild, 1969. This work is the translation of *Primo viaggio intorno al globo terracqueo*, based on the original text of the Ambrosian codex translated by James A. Robertson, reproduced with slight corrections.

5. An essay which provides a perspective on Pacific history is: H. E. Maude, "Pacific History: Past, Present, and Future," *Journal of Pacific History*, v.11, 1976, pp.3ff.

6. An exhaustive listing is not possible here; several general works are: C. Hartley Grattan, *The Southwest Pacific to 1900*, Ann Arbor, Michigan University Press, 1963; C. Hartley Grattan, *The Southwest Pacific Since 1900*, Ann Arbor, Michigan University Press, 1963; John L. Fischer, *The Eastern Carolines*, New Haven, HRAF Press, 1966; Janet Davidson and Deryck Scarr, eds., *Pacific Island Portraits*, Wellington, New Zealand, Reed, 1973; Peter Bellwood, *Man's Conquest of the Pacific*, New Zealand, Reed, 1973; Peter Bellwood, *Man's Conquest of the Pacific*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1979; Gerard Ward, ed., *American Activities in the*

*Central Pacific, 1790-1890*, New Jersey, 1967, 8 volumes; Francis X. Hezel, *The First Taint of Civilization*; UHawaii Press, 1983; Kerry Howe, *Where the Waves Fall*, UHawaii Press, 1984.

7. J. W. Davidson, "Problems of Pacific History," *Journal of Pacific History*, v.1, 1966, pp.5-21.

8. Kerry Howe, "Pacific Islands History in the 1980s," *Pacific Studies*, n.4, 1979, pp.81ff.

9. Oskar H. K. Spate, "The Pacific As An Artifact," *The Changing Pacific*, Oxford University Press, 1978, p.34, cited by Howe, *ibid*.

10. Howe, *op.cit*.

11. Gregory Denning in a review in *New Zealand Journal of History*, no.12, 1978, p.83, cited by Howe, *Ibid*.

12. Peter Bellwood, *Ibid*.

13. Caroline Ralston, "Writing Pacific History: The State of the Art," *Pacific Islands Monthly*, November 1982, p.57.

14. Francis X. Hezel, *Ibid*.

15. Kerry R. Howe, *Where the Waves Fall*, University of Hawaii Press, 1984.

16. Francis X. Hezel, a Jesuit priest, has been resident in Truk since 1965 and has contributed many articles in history to the growing literature on the region since then. He has several books to his credit in history, including: *Foreign Ships in Micronesia: A Compendium of Ship Contacts with the Caroline and Marshall Islands, 1521-1885*, Saipan, HPO Monograph, 1979, and *Winds of Change*, (ed. with Mark Berg), *A Book of Readings on Micronesian History*, Saipan, Department of Education, 1979.

17. See Howe's final chapter on "The New Historiography," in *Where the Waves Fall*, Honolulu, UHawaii Press, 1984.

18. David L. Hanlon, *Upon A Stone Alter: A History of the Island of Pohnpei to the Year 1890*, UHawaii Press, 1988.

19. Luelen Bernart, *The Book of Luelen*, translated and edited by Saul H. Riesenberg, John L. Fischer, and Margaret Whiting, Honolulu, UHawaii Press, 1977.

20. Written in the late 1930s and early 1940s, *The Book of Luelen* is an excellent example of oral history put into writing. Luelen was a titled Pohnpeian who worked for

programs.<sup>37</sup>

These men and women are returning to the islands with—if not a mastery of western intellectual skills of reading and writing—an inclination and motivation to interpret, record, and produce information which is providing an entirely new cast to our view of Micronesia and the Pacific world. These western intellectual skills are being adapted and put to use on terms which the Micronesians themselves are devising and dictating, but they are nonetheless valid and increasingly must be recognized.<sup>38</sup>

During the same period of time there have been large numbers of expatriates who have come to live and work in the islands in more integrative ways than have the outsiders of times past. In addition to many who have “married in” to the cultures, there have been an estimated 10,000 U.S. Peace Corps Volunteers who have served in Micronesia in various capacities since 1966.<sup>39</sup> About one third of this number have been teachers in schools and in the communities.<sup>40</sup>

Unofficial estimates have some seven *per cent* as having remained after their tours of service to engage in business, social services and other pursuits.<sup>41</sup> Their understandings and sensitivities are deeper than those of foreigners who have preceded them at other times.<sup>42</sup>

The former Historic Preservation Officer<sup>43</sup> for the Trust Territory of the Pacific is an ex-Peace Corps Volunteer, and over the past ten years has been responsible for the fourteen or so Micronesian historical research projects that have been undertaken.<sup>44</sup>

A seven year history writing project, sponsored by the Palau Community Action Agency in Koror, Palau, has since 1975 resulted in the publication of four volumes of local history.<sup>45</sup> Peace Corps Volunteers conversant in the Palauan language, and at ease in the culture, were involved in this production at every phase.

These contributions to Micronesian historiography have been both significant and valuable inside of Micronesia as well as without. Some of these materials are currently being used in

Micronesian history courses offered at high schools and colleges in the islands,<sup>46</sup> and they are also used elsewhere.<sup>47</sup>

This description of three paradigms of Micronesian historiography—*Colonial*, *Traditional*, and *Critical*—is intended only as a beginning effort in the reexamination and restructuring of the Micronesian historical experience as it is represented in the literature. The paradigms are not offered as a final word, but rather as a point of departure for historians and other commentators on the current Micronesian scene to build upon.

These developments should be seen as a part of a continuum of experience which has its roots in the very first accounts of visitations by the early European explorers in the region, and which carries through to the most recent monographs on history prepared by observers of the area. They are useful as a way for present practitioners to orient themselves to the Micronesia scene, and also to provide insight and sensitivity for those desirous of making historiographic contributions.

The future portends a continuing synthesis which could well result in a body of new Micronesian historiography which will have a distinctive theoretical basis, methodology, and even jargon of its own. It is one also that should be welcomed and nurtured, for it will provide historians with a richness of interpretation which will be entirely new, uniquely Micronesian, and altogether enlightening.

## NOTES

This paper is based upon remarks made at the Guam Conference on Interpreting Critical Issues in Resource Management, April 1990, sponsored by the U.S. National Park Service, and the Arizona Memorial Foundation, Honolulu, Hawaii. I am appreciative of the Park Service who enabled me to complete the paper.

1. The term “American flag areas” is commonly used in referring to those Pacific islands under U.S. political control other than Hawaii; they include: Midway, Wake, Guam, Johnston, Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, American

were sustained; and finally, how they have been applied, reinforced, and altered over time.

This history is of apparently little interest and consequence to the colonial or the outsider, but often of considerable importance to the islanders themselves. It is a realm of Micronesian history about which precious little is known to western historians, and therefore its evaluation and assessment has not taken place, except in an extremely limited degree, at the present time.<sup>32</sup>

There are no native "historians" in the western sense of the term among the Micronesians. But there are those in the islands who are the keepers of special information, and who are capable of interpreting and passing on their knowledge to others.

In Micronesia men and women are distinguished from one another largely by what they know. Talents vary, but one rule governs: a person cannot tell all that he knows lest he lose that which makes him special. To reveal all is to die. The Palauans say: *Ng kora oseh el a mengur el di ngara melkolk el mora melkolk!* "Some knowledge, like the juice of the coconut, passes from darkness to darkness."

Although it is doubtful that any earthshaking information would be learned from being able to "crack" the traditional historical knowledge barriers in Micronesia, it seems certain that such revelation, if it is possible in the future, will considerably alter the interpretations of the past colonial experiences.<sup>33</sup>

The third paradigm of Micronesian history might be called *critical*. It is a synthesis of the *colonial* and the *traditional* paradigms; but, while it is something of an amalgam of these two modes, it is also considerably more. Critical Micronesian history attempts to relate the historical experience from the point of view of the islanders: how they coped with and reacted to the various outside influences which have swept over them in the course of time as "waves sweep over a beach"<sup>34</sup> each receding one being overtaken by a fresh, new tumult of crashing water.

Of course, the traditional paradigm also relates

history from the islanders' side: the difference being that the critical approach uses the classical tools of historiography, in connection with other techniques, in an effort to extract an islanders' view. Another difference is in the audience of the critical approach and the mode of its presentation. Traditional Micronesian history is for a small group of privileged specialists; critical Micronesian history is aimed at the community at large.

The intellectual nature of these two modes of traditional and critical Micronesian history also manifests a fundamental difference in the views of knowledge held generally by Micronesians and westerners. In Micronesia, knowledge, as has been indicated earlier, is largely private property; it is also finite, and the listener or receiver is not given to questioning the validity of versions by a specialist. In the West,<sup>35</sup> conversely, knowledge is usually considered public property and also infinite; questioning all aspects of any version on any subject is encouraged and condoned as a path toward even greater enlightenment.

An awareness of this dichotomy of views of knowledge is essential for the practitioner of critical Micronesian history. A historian, in order to practice in this mode, not only needs sound professional training as it is commonly dispensed in the West, but also a good measure of local experience. He or she must have a prolonged tenure in the islands, must know the people, understand the local cultures, and be at least familiar with the language. Only with these tools will the person have the wherewithall to attempt an interpretation which will be useful, acceptable, and appropriate for the modern-day Micronesian reality.

The capacity for this kind of historiographical practice comes directly out of the history of today's times. Over the past fifteen years there has been a veritable educational explosion in Micronesia as a result of American policies of educational and social development.<sup>36</sup> In the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s, thousands of Micronesians have gained access to higher education through a variety of government scholarship

Micronesian historiography. The political events in Micronesia, in particular, would indicate that from now on the history of that area will be continually rewritten and reappraised in ways which will reflect the advent of self-government and determination, and the attending growing nationalism among the people. What are these paradigms? How useful are they? What might their futures be?

At least three paradigms of Micronesian historiography, I believe, can be identified.<sup>22</sup> The term *colonial history* is a workable one as a point of departure for the identification of the origin of modern Micronesian history (as opposed to the prehistory of the area). Mostly it has been the history of singular colonial activities: the Spanish, the Germans, the Japanese, and the Americans.<sup>23</sup>

Within the imperial expression of the particular writers' fields, a narrow point of view is coming to the fore, depending partly on whether the historian or writer is an economist, an anthropologist, a sociologist, a political scientist, or other social scientist, and partly on the fact that writers have been nationals of the colonial powers or of some other metropolitan society.

F.W. Christian's *The Caroline Islands*,<sup>24</sup> is an account by an educated, informed traveler in the region—not a professional historian—at the close of the Spanish period. He provides valuable information and observation, but never assumes or indicates even a hint of a local political point of view.<sup>25</sup>

Yanaihara Tadao's *Pacific Islands Under Japanese Mandate*,<sup>26</sup> which appeared toward the end of the Japanese period, provides a generous and comprehensive account of the accomplishments of the Japanese South Seas Bureau (*Nan-yo Cho*) in Micronesia. Although professor Yanaihara was one of the most liberal of Japanese colonial scholars, his account never seriously questions the right of the Japanese to govern the islands in the first place.<sup>27</sup>

In most cases this literature, as is the case with the two examples just cited, has to do with the extension of the empire into the particular Pacific island area—Micronesia in this case—and the

problems faced in the course of this extension. Professor Davidson summed it up very well when he observed that “policy has to be implemented in the face of local circumstances in the colonies; and these circumstances are dependent, not primarily upon the existence of the political link with the metropolitan country, but upon the colony's internal social structure.”<sup>28</sup>

It is precisely this internal social structure in Micronesia which is at best neglected, and at worst overlooked entirely in colonial histories and political commentary of Micronesia.

The American period of Trusteeship is something of an exception to this assertion, but only a slight exception. The American performance has been soundly and repeatedly criticized by a number of American writers,<sup>29</sup> there has been a propensity to take the Micronesian point of view. But, even when this view has been taken, it has still been as an indictment of American administrative performance rather than as a questioning of the U.S.'s basic right to governance.<sup>30</sup>

It should be emphasized that the colonial paradigm is legitimate historiography, and the contributions made in this mode have contributed immeasurably to the understanding of the area. Indeed, much less would be known today were it not for those efforts by colonial historians, as well as those in modern and contemporary times who have used primarily “colonial documentation.” Moreover, this paradigm will continue to remain a valid approach to Micronesian historiography as greater amounts of archival materials become available, and are used as a basis for interpretation.<sup>31</sup>

A second Micronesian historiographical paradigm might be termed *traditional island history*, or that which is intrinsic to the particular island or group. Here is presented the islanders' exclusive realm of oral history; stories and legends. The knowledge in this realm passed from one generation to the next by word of mouth. Here is found the local accounts of how certain clans came into positions of political dominance on certain islands; how customs, beliefs, and traditions developed and

the Marianas.<sup>4</sup> Micronesian history, considered comprehensively since Pigafetta, however, is not an esoteric discipline, isolated, with a distinctive theoretical basis, jargon, and method; rather it is a specialization within the broader realm of historical study of the Pacific.

This broader realm belongs to the field of *modern* history as distinguished from *ancient* history. It is within this context that the present discussion is placed.<sup>5</sup> The modern study of Micronesian history has contributed significantly to our understanding of the region, especially since the arrival of the whalers, traders, and colonials during the nineteenth century. There has been an enormous amount of historical literature devoted to this modern period.<sup>6</sup>

But, while this historical literature has been bountiful, it has also lacked "a basic direction" as has been indicated by the late J.W. Davidson of Australia,<sup>7</sup> and it has also been accused of heading toward a state of "monograph myopia"—narrating more and more about less and less—by Kerry Howe of New Zealand.<sup>8</sup> Howe has pointed to a metaphor used by the Australian historian, Oskar H. K. Spate, in commenting upon the work of many Pacific historians who "may on occasion not see the Ocean for the Islands, may be content to be marooned in the tight but so safe confines of their little atoll of knowledge, regardless of the sweep of the currents which bring life to the isles."<sup>9</sup>

Professor Howe accuses western Pacific historians of a certain complacency in being so narrow in their orientation, and questions: "are they not in danger of adopting an unthinking, empiricist approach?"<sup>10</sup> Professor Greg Denning of New Zealand, has also expressed this view:

If we applied the standards expected of social history in the United States, Britain, and the continent, and the standards expected of cross-cultural histories elsewhere in the world, then we would have to say the Pacific is an historically under-developed area.<sup>11</sup>

With all of these indictments, there are, happily, some bright spots. The appearance, in 1978, of Peter Bellwood's *Man's Conquest of the Pacific:*

*The Pre-History of Southeast Asia and Oceania*<sup>12</sup> offers "the first and only substantial general account of the pre-history of the region."<sup>13</sup>

More recently we have Francis X. Hezel's *The First Taint of Civilization: A History of the Caroline and Marshall Islands in Pre-Colonial Days, 1521-1885*,<sup>14</sup> and Kerry Howe's *Where the Waves Fall: A New South Sea Islands History From First Settlement to Colonial Rule*.<sup>15</sup>

Both of these works take a broad view of the history of the region. Hezel, on Micronesia, attempts an objective consideration, using the widest possible range of available western documentation,<sup>16</sup> while Howe offers a fundamental departure from the standard historiography in the West to show how the various outside influences affected the people who lived on the islands. He shows how Alan Morehead's "fatal impact" on the Pacific was far from fatal. Furthermore, Howe suggests that it is not at all clear that the western influence has been overriding or even beneficial.<sup>17</sup>

David Hanlon's award winning *History of Pohnpei*, which uses oral sources of the first time as an integral and accepted part of research and interpretation, has provided a momentous breakthrough. Dr. Hanlon has also demonstrated that you don't have to be ethnically an islander to interpret island history.<sup>18</sup>

Today we have the appearance of many Pacific islanders themselves who are writing and publishing their own accounts and interpretations. An important work on Pohnpeian history by Luelen Bernart appeared in 1978.<sup>19</sup> It is the first historical account of the island to be written by a native Pohnpeian.<sup>20</sup>

Other notable work being done in the local Pacific history area is taking place at the Institute of Pacific Studies at the University of the South Pacific in Fiji.<sup>21</sup> Here we have a blend of islanders and western scholars working together to produce volumee of material which will reinterpret and change Pacific history.

These situations, I submit, of changing historiography in general call for a closer look at the various developing paradigms, or modes, of

# INTERPRETING THE CULTURES OF MICRONESIA: THREE PARADIGMS OF PACIFIC HISTORIOGRAPHY

by

Dirk Anthony Ballendorf

Professor of History and Micronesian Studies

University of Guam

Interpreting the cultures, societies, and histories of the various island groups of the Pacific world has been, up until recently, largely a Western-oriented and directed affair. This orientation must now, I believe, change fundamentally, and not merely instrumentally.

The political and social developments which have occurred in the Pacific Islands of Micronesia over the past three decades call for a rethinking of historians' views of the approaches to chronicling the region's history. Moreover, the dramatic changes in the formal political status of Micronesia demand a more enlightened awareness of the area by trained observers in the West and elsewhere.

The European involvement in Micronesia began with the arrival of Ferdinand Magellan who touched briefly at Guam in 1521 during his vessels' famous circumnavigation of the globe. Since then there have been four successive colonial administrations in that part of the Micronesia which can be referred to as the "American flag areas:"<sup>1</sup> Spanish, 1521 to 1898; German, 1899 to 1914; Japanese, 1914 to 1944; and American, 1944 to the present.

The length of the Spanish period, however, is misleading. Although the Spanish had legitimate claim to the area, they did not effectively begin administration until 1668 with the arrival of the Spanish Jesuit missionary Fray Diego Luis de

Sanvitores; and then only in the Marianas, particularly Guam. The rest of the islands had limited exposure to foreigners until after 1884 when the Germans posed a threat to Spanish control causing the government in Madrid to exercise greater authority, and to send more missionaries to Micronesia.<sup>2</sup>

This Spanish presence, however, was short-lived, and was followed by German administration after the Spanish-American War in 1898. With the outbreak of WWI, the Japanese navy occupied all German lands north of the equator during three weeks in October 1914. Their subsequent colonization was deliberate and sanctioned under the League of Nations Mandates System, and intended to incorporate Micronesia with the home islands.<sup>3</sup> The Americans wrested the islands from the Japanese in a series of bloody battles during WWII. By 1946 virtually all Japanese had been repatriated, and in 1947 President Truman signed a Trusteeship Agreement with the United Nations for the administration of Micronesia.

The written historiography of Micronesia began with the journals of Antonio Pigafetta, the gentleman-scholar who talked his way aboard Magellan's ship, *Victoria*, as chronicler of the first voyage around the world. Almost everything we know about that voyage comes from his recorded observations, including accounts of the islanders in